

Lakes, August 2, 1903 (*B. L. Robinson*). Similar specimens have been collected by Mr. F. F. Forbes on the Matane River, Quebec.

CAREX BULLATA Schkuhr, Reidgr. Nachtr. 85, t. U u u, fig. 166 (1806) was described with "spicis . . . femineis binis cylindraceis"; and in the figure two inflorescences are shown with three spikes varying from 2.85 to 3.3 cm. long, and from 1 to 1.2 cm. thick, i. e. definitely cylindric. In recent years, however, the name *C. bullata* has been applied to a plant with the spikes subglobose or thick-cylindric, an extreme of the species generally more common than the plant with narrowly cylindric spikes; while the plant with more slender spikes has been variously treated as a species, *C. Olneyi* Boott, as a hybrid between *C. bullata* and *C. utriculata*, and as an extreme variety of *C. bullata*. Comparison with Schkuhr's original description and figure shows, however, that *C. Olneyi* is the plant which he had in hand, and we must, therefore, treat the two extreme variations as follows.

C. BULLATA Schkuhr. Pistillate spikes 1 or 2, cylindric, 2.5 to 5 cm. long, 1 to 1.5 cm. thick: perigynia dull or slightly lustrous.—Riedgr. Nachtr. 85, t. U u u, fig. 166 (1806). *C. Olneyi* Boott, Ill. i. 15, t. 42 (1858). *C. bullata* × *utriculata* Bailey, Proc. Am. Acad. xxii. 68 (1887). *C. monile* Britton, Bull. Torr. Bot. Club, xxii. 221 (1895), not Tuck. *C. bullata*, var. *Olneyi* Fernald, RHODORA, iii. 52 (1901).

Var. **Greenii** (Boeckl.), n. comb. Spikes globose to thick-cylindric, 1 to 4 cm. long, 1.5 to 2 cm. thick: perigynia lustrous.—*C. Greenii* Boeckl. Flora, xli. 649 (1858). *C. bullata*, Am. Authors.

GRAY HERBARIUM.

FILIPENDULA RUBRA, A NEW BINOMIAL.

B. L. ROBINSON.

FEW of the native plants of the Middle West exceed in beauty the "Queen of the Prairie," with its pinnate leaves, palmately lobed leaflets, and numerous gracefully paniced flowers, which according to the apt description of Dr. Gray are "deep peach-blossom color." The species has been extensively cultivated both within and east of its natural range, and has now become established as an escape from gardens in some parts of Vermont and Connecticut, perhaps elsewhere

in New England. As it is now a member of the flora of our region and must be included in various local lists, the question of its correct scientific name is likely to arise, and it may be in place to say a few words on this point.

From a general habital resemblance to *Spiraea*, the species and some of its European allies were long referred to that genus. Maximowicz, however, after long and critical study of the group, expressed with great definiteness the view that the genus *Filipendula* bore no close affinity to *Spiraea*, but was rather to be placed near *Geum*, his statement being as follows:

“Genus hucusque inter *Spiraeas* receptum certe ab illis omnibusque *Spiraeaceis* abhorret achaeniis indehiscentibus caducis 1-spermis, stigmatibus amplo et staminibus post anthesin deciduis filamentis sub anthera subincrassato neque attenuato. Inter *Rosaceas* igitur ponendum, ubi modo crescendi, foliis, stipulis, fragrantia qualitateque rhizomatum, nec non inflorescentia (etsi multo divitiore ramisque adventitiis aucta) cum *Geo* et affinibus ubi in nonnullis etiam iteratim trichotoma flore centrali brevior occurrit, bene convenire videtur.”¹

For the genus, thus separated from *Spiraea*, Maximowicz takes up *Filipendula*, a name dating from the sixteenth century. Maximowicz attributes the name to Linnaeus, however, and cites his *Genera* ed. 1, p. 145 and *Species Plantarum* ed. 4, p. 172. It is clear that the latter reference is merely a clerical error for Linnaeus's *Genera*, ed. 4, p. 172. Both of these editions of the *Genera* appeared before 1753, the date now generally adopted as the starting point for modern botanical nomenclature, and the plants in question were later referred by Linnaeus in the several editions of his *Species* and *Systema* to *Spiraea*. The first use of *Filipendula* subsequent to 1753 is by Adanson,² whose description, although brief, is accompanied by definite references to the works of Tournefort and Linnaeus in such a manner as to leave no doubt as to its precise application. It is to Adanson, therefore, that the genus as a part of modern nomenclature should be ascribed.

Although Maximowicz selected the earliest generic name, he unfortunately adopted the specific name *lobata* from *Spiraea lobata* Gronov., having apparently overlooked the earlier specific name *rubra*, employed by Hill under *Ulmaria*. The Vienna rules of nomenclature require the union of the oldest specific and generic names, as follows:—

¹ Act. Hort. Petrop. vi. 246 (1879).

² Families des Plantes, ii. 295 (1763).

Filipendula rubra (Hill), n. comb.

Ulmaria rubra Hill, Hort. Kew. ed. 1, 214 (1768).

Spiraea lobata Gronov. ex Jacq. Hort. Vindob. i. 38, t. 88 (1770).

Spiraea palmata L. Syst. ed. 13, p. 393 (1774).

Ulmaria lobata Kostel. Ind. Prag. (1844) ex Maxim. Act. Hort. Petrop. iv. 251 (1879).

Filipendula lobata Maxim. Act. Hort. Petrop. vi. 251 (1879).

The only question which seems likely to arise in regard to this disposition of our species, is whether the old genus *Ulmaria* should be treated as generically separable from *Filipendula*, but for this there seems no rational ground. Historically the two genera rest upon the European *Spiraea Filipendula* and *S. Ulmaria* respectively. These species, familiar in cultivation, exhibit an inflorescence of identical plan and flowers without sufficiently important differences to suggest even subgeneric or sectional distinctions to the more critical writers who have occupied themselves with the group. It is true that the small very numerous leaflets in the type of *Filipendula* and their pinnatifid contour give the plant a rather characteristic appearance markedly different from the type of *Ulmaria*, but when the Asian species with leaflets of intermediate number, size, and form are taken into account, it will be seen that these foliar differences are by no means distinctions of constancy or moment. It is to be noticed, also, that there is a general consensus among scholarly students of the *Rosaceae* that these genera should be united; see for example, Maximowicz, l. c., Focke in Engl. & Prantl, Nat. Pflanzenf. iii. Ab. 3, 40 (1888) & Nactr. 187 (1897), Rehder in Bailey, Cycl. Hort. 1878 (1902), Aschers. & Graebn. Syn. mitteleur. Fl. vi. 436 (1902), etc.

GRAY HERBARIUM.

Vol. 8, no. 93, including pages 169 to 188 was issued 8 October, 1906.